



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,558	02/17/2006	Minoru Shibasaki	1176/312	6451
46852 LIU & LIU 444 S. FLOWER STREET, SUITE 1750 LOS ANGELES, CA 90071	7590 06/10/2009		EXAMINER WONG, ERIC K	
			ART UNIT 2883	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/10/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/568,558

Applicant(s)

SHIBAZAKI, MINORU

Examiner

Eric Wong

Art Unit

2883

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims rejected in the prior office action have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 6, 8-12, 17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 3,785,721 to Harsch and further in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art, JP9-105958 (hereinafter JP958).**

Harsch discloses in figures 1-3, a display apparatus including a display device for displaying an image or a picture and a viewing angle controlling unit arranged over said display device, said viewing angle controlling unit comprising:

- A pair of substrates (12, 14), each comprising at least an electrode (18, 20) and an alignment film facing each other such that alignment films are opposite each other.
- Liquid crystal layer (16) sandwiched inbetween.
- A pair of polarized plates (26, 28) arranged outside said pair of substrates;
- Wherein rubbing directions of the respective alignment films of said pair of substrates are substantially parallel to each other (column 3, lines 29-30).

As to claims 2-5 and 13-16, the plates have rubbing directions that can be configured as claimed.

As to claims 6 and 17, a power source is disclosed (32).

As to claims 8 and 19, the plates are transparent (column 3, lines 44-65).

As to claims 9 and 11, the display is a light emitting display.

As to claim 10, the controlling unit (power source and electrodes) is arranged on the display screen.

However, Harsch fails to explicitly disclose the optical axis of one polarized plate is substantially parallel to said rubbing directions. It is noted that Harsch was published in 1974 and though not common at the time, viewing angle screens are widely used now for security, privacy and performance reasons. Harsch also does not limit the number of plates or layers in his invention.

JP958 discloses such a "screen" with the polarization plate direction as claimed (figures 10 and 13).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the polarization plate angle as disclosed by JP958 in the invention of Harsch in order to improve performance and/or to provide security and privacy.

4. Claims 2-5 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harsch as applied to claims above.

Harsch discloses the invention as claimed except for arrangement of polarizing plates in a crossed Nichols way. It is noted that Harsch does not limit the type of arrangement. Further, it does not appear Applicant has established any criticality in using one arrangement over the other

(crossed-Nichols vs. parallel Nichols; see applicant Specification paragraph 7). By merely using one known method over the other is a general engineering practice to provide optimal optical transmission. Examiner's contention of this obvious choice in design can be overcome if Applicant establishes unexpected results by using one arrangement over the other.

5. Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Penn as applied to claims above.

'958 discloses the display device as claimed except for a retardation value of a liquid crystal layer being within 200nm to 1000nm. It is respectfully noted that such a retardation value could be commonly selected from a known variety of liquid crystal materials known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a liquid crystal layer having the retardation value range as claimed since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art and would have at least have been obvious to try. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Wong whose telephone number is (571)272-2363. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 830AM - 430PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank Font can be reached on 571-272-2415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eric Wong/
Examiner, Art Unit 2883

/Frank G Font/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2883

FGF/ew